



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The third publication may finally be mentioned as an indication of the constant spread of Ahad Ha-'am's influence. The German edition of Ahad Ha-'am is one of the few Jewish books in German which have lived to see a second edition. Ahad Ha-'am's essays have evidently taken a deep hold on a certain section of German Jewry, particularly among the academic youth. I am informed that the Jewish student societies in Germany make the admission and promotion of their members—the Jewish societies follow the system of the *Burschenschaften*—dependent on the study of A. H.'s writings. The German translation differs in its make-up from the English. It limits itself to selections from the first Hebrew volume, except for the last essay on Nietzsche (from the second Hebrew volume) which was added in the new edition. The essays selected are mainly of a publicistic character bearing largely on the Palestinian movement, for the Jewish public in Germany is far better acquainted with that movement than it is in England or America. An introduction supplies the necessary biographical and bibliographical data and offers a short analysis of the principal ideas of Ahad Ha-'am. The second edition has been carefully revised by the translator in conjunction with the author.

The *Jüdischer Verlag* promises the publication of a second volume of A. H.'s essays which is in the course of preparation by a different translator.

MITTWOCH'S ISLAMIC LITURGY AND CULT

Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des islamischen Gebets und Kultus.

By Prof. Dr. EUGEN MITTWOCH. [Reprint from *Abhandlungen der Königl. preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.*]

Berlin, 1913, pp. 42. 4^o.

The above treatise anticipates a larger work by the same author which is to deal with 'the influence of Judaism upon the law of Islam in all its branches'. It limits itself to an examination of the Mohammedan cult and liturgy and endeavours to fix

the share of Judaism in the genesis of this vital province of Mohammedanism. Stray facts illustrating the influence of Judaism in this particular direction have been pointed out by others. Professor Mittwoch, however, has gathered the material, both Jewish and Mohammedan, systematically, and has subjected it to a searching analysis. Many points of contact observed or ingeniously conjectured by our author are as obvious as they are surprising. Thus the Mohammedan prescriptions regarding bodily purity as a condition for prayer closely resemble those of Judaism, and the author is right in supposing that these precepts, which have gradually come into disuse in Judaism, must still have been observed by the Jews of Arabia (p. 14). The ablutions preceding prayer, which are so characteristic a feature of the Mohammedan ritual, no doubt go back to Jewish models, and one has only to read Lane's description of the implements for ablution (*Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, Ch. III) to be vividly reminded of Jewish parallels. The requirement of the *niyya*, the concentration, verbally the 'intention', during prayer, corresponds both in conception and term to the Talmudic precept regarding *Kawwāna* (p. 16), while, it may be added, the expression of this intention in a definite formula has, at least, its parallel in a similar practice of Judaism.¹ The *Kibla*, the direction in prayer, originally towards Jerusalem, subsequently towards Mecca, is universally recognized as an adaptation from Judaism, and it may be added, as an interesting illustration of the mutual character of the relationship between the two religions, that the Jewish-Arabic writers designate in turn the *Mizrah* of the synagogue by that Mohammedan term. The Jewish practice of standing at the wall during prayer, and the further precept that no separating object be placed between the wall and the praying person, have been taken over by Islam (p. 15). The term *Ṣalāt* (originally

¹ The formula *הנני מוכן* or *הריני מוכן*, which is still widely used, originated in the Kabbalistic circle in Palestine in the sixteenth to seventeenth century. Comp. A. Berliner, *Randbemerkungen zum täglichen Gebetbuch*, I, p. 36. As the environment was Mohammedan, the formula may well have been borrowed from Islam or influenced by it.

ṣalōt) from Aramaic צלות was borrowed, as Professor Mittwoch rightly points out (p. 6), not from the Christians but, like other Aramaic terms, from the Jews of Arabia and was employed, as the author ingeniously conjectures, not only in the general sense of prayer, but also, corresponding to the Talmudic designation of the *Shmoneh Eserēh* as צלותא (or תפלה), in the specific meaning of the essential part of the Mohammedan service, in distinction from its less essential portions. The *Kiyām*, or the standing recitation of the *Ṣalāt*, and particularly the expression *aḵāma aṣ-ṣalāt*, 'to make the prayers stand up', in the sense of 'reciting the prayers', strikingly resembles the Jewish practice of standing during the *Shmoneh Eserēh* and the designation of the latter as 'Amidah (p. 16), a resemblance which is the more interesting since the other gestures of prayer prevalent in Islam (particularly kneeling and bowing, see later) might have naturally suggested a different term. The *Kirā'a*, the recitation of the Koran, which is an essential part of the *Ṣalāt*, is convincingly identified with קריאת שמע, and a trace of its original limitation to two daily prayers, as in Judaism, is subtly detected by the author (p. 17). The *Salām*, 'the greeting' at the end of the Mohammedan liturgy closely corresponds to the ברכה השלום and, just as in Judaism, is repeated twice (עושה שלום and שים שלום), the second time, in exact accord with the Jewish practice, inaudibly and with the same movements of the head towards the right and the left (p. 18). Thus the influence of Judaism upon the Mohammedan ritual, not only in its general outlines but also in its specific details, is raised by Professor Mittwoch to indisputable certainty.

It seems to me, however, that Professor Mittwoch goes somewhat too far in the application of his theory. Having once established by an array of interesting, sometimes striking illustrations, the importance of Judaism in the development of the Mohammedan cult, the author concludes that everything in this particular domain of Islam must be derived from the same source. But such a conclusion is entirely unwarranted. In the first place, Professor Mittwoch himself will surely not deny that a parallel, however close and striking, does not always imply borrowing,

but may be the result of similar historic conditions. Thus the author endeavours to prove (pp. 31, 35) that the Mohammedan precept which limits the holding of the *Ṣalāt al-jum'a*, the public Friday service, in a *miṣr* or municipality is derived from the opinion of R. Eleazar ben 'Azariah (Mishnah, *Berakot*, IV, 7) that the *Musaf* service be only held *בהכר עיר*. But the rise of the *amṣār* from military camps and the rôle of the public service in Islam as a disciplinary factor, and as a manifestation of communal and even political life, fully and naturally account for the condition attaching to the Friday service. In a similar manner, Professor Mittwoch connects the Mohammedan custom of holding the holiday services, in distinction from the Friday services, on the *muṣallā*, an open place before the mosque, with the Jewish practice mentioned in the Mishnah of holding the services on fast days (on the occasion of drought), on the street (p. 34). But, apart from the incongruity between festivals and fast days, in both cases the greater attendance to be expected on such occasions makes the use of an open place, particularly in the East, perfectly intelligible, and similarly the larger number of benedictions required on these occasions both by Judaism and Islam are fully accounted for by the solemnity of the ceremony. A striking illustration of a coincidence without any historic connexion is, in my opinion, the *raf' al-yadain*, 'the raising of the hands' (p. 18), a supplication recited with raised hands at the end of the obligatory prayers. The term corresponds verbally to *נשיאת כפים*, yet has nothing to do with it. It differs essentially from the Jewish ceremony, first in its application, for in Islam it is neither a priestly function nor has it the character of a blessing, but is rather a supplication, and is the duty of every praying person. It further differs in its external form, for in Islam the palms are *drawn together* and lifted *towards* the face. It is evidently one of the numerous ancient gestures of prayer preserved in the Mohammedan ritual and differs from the biblical gesture, which, as indicated by the verb *פָּרַשׁ* generally applied to it, consisted in stretching out the palms.

Again it seems to us that in his attempt to prove the complete

and systematic derivation of the Mohammedan ritual from Judaism Professor Mittwoch does not take sufficiently into account that, judging *a priori*, it is scarcely conceivable that the religion of Islam which teaches as a cardinal doctrine the abrogation of Judaism and Christianity could adopt from either systematically and, hence, consciously a whole set of practices or liturgies. An examination of the legendary and, what was originally identical, the historic material of the sacred literature which Islam borrowed from Judaism shows the extensive, sometimes completely obliterating modifications which have taken place in the course of transmission, and it is only natural that in the case of concrete institutions which have to adapt themselves to stubborn reality such modifications should even be more extensive.

Another factor to which Professor Mittwoch does not pay sufficient attention is the influence of Christianity. We need not accept Wellhausen's dictum that Islam owes the dough to Judaism and the leaven to Christianity. Nor need we agree to the clear-cut formula of Professor Becker, who in his highly interesting study of the same subject,² distributes Jewish, Christian, and Persian influences respectively over the three periods marked by the life of the prophet, the Omayyad and the Abbassid rule. But without going to the extreme, the probability of Christian influence on the Mohammedan cult must be admitted *a priori*. For the outstanding, unrivalled importance which is assigned to prayer in Islam, the fundamental character of the *Ṣalāt* as a system of kneeling and bowing,—it was just this aspect of the Mohammedan prayer which aroused the resentment of the free Arabs,—the very designation of the mosque as *masjid*, 'a place of prostration', the indisputable dependence of Mohammedan religious architecture on Christian models, all this clearly suggests Christian influence, in spite of isolated Jewish parallels which can be quoted and are quoted by Professor Mittwoch from Judaism.³

² *Zur Geschichte des islamischen Kultus. Der Islam*, 1912, p. 398.

³ The isolated Talmudic utterances about the importance of prayer (Mittwoch, *loc. cit.*, p. 5, note 6) cannot account for the much greater emphasis laid on prayer in Islam. According to the Talmudic conception, study is

To quote concrete examples, our author endeavours to derive the five daily prayers of Islam from the three Jewish prayers by assuming that the *Mincha* and the *Ma'rib* prayer have, on account of the latitude in the period of their recitation, been amplified in Islam into four prayers (p. 11 f.). But such an adaptation would presuppose not only an intimate study of the Jewish ritual but also a conscious tendency to adhere strictly to it, and such a tendency is highly improbable. If the frequently expressed view which draws upon the five prayers in Parsism be unacceptable, and if the assumption that Islam has simply endeavoured to increase the obligations of Judaism⁴ does not carry conviction, then one would rather feel inclined to derive, as indeed Professor Mittwoch himself faintly suggests (p. 13), from the five prayers on *Yom Kippur*. For from the purely psychological point of view it would appear natural that the services on the high holidays made a greater impression upon the Mohammedans and were in consequence better known to them than the services on other days, and there are some other indications in the same direction.⁵

Again, the public service on Friday is shown to be an exact copy of the Sabbath service (p. 27 ff.), and the *Müsaf* prayer, the Pentateuch reading and the prophetic lesson, with their accompanying benedictions, the sitting down during the *Gelilah* and יקום פרקן, are drawn upon to explain the details of the Moham-

more important than prayer. The same applies to the prostrations in Judaism (p. 17 below). An isolated parallel to *masjid* is בית השתחוות in the *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, ed. Schechter, comp. *ibid.*, p. xxv.

⁴ The legend according to which Moses advised Mohammed to reduce the number of prayers to less than five (comp. Goldziher, *Mohammedanische Studien*, I, 36) may, apart from its anti-Arabic tendency, also have a polemical tendency against the small number of prayers in Judaism.

⁵ The frequently quoted explanation of the institution of the *Adān*, the call to prayer, as a conscious departure from the Christian knocker and the Jewish trumpet, seems to point to the Shofar on New Year, the function of which was misunderstood. Similarly the frequent prostrations on *Yom Kippur* (partly on *Rosh Hashana*) may have served as a contributory cause to impress upon the Mohammedans the form of prostration as an essential feature of prayer.

medan ritual. Fascinating and brilliant as the whole hypothesis is, it arouses our suspicion by the very extent of imitation it presupposes, an imitation which would only be intelligible if Islam had consciously set about to reproduce the Jewish liturgy. And indeed when, armed with this healthy scepticism, we approach the hypothesis closely, the resemblance loses much of its fascination. To take a specific example. The outstanding feature of the Friday service is the double sermon or *Khuṭba*, which is so arranged that the preacher sits down in the middle for a few moments of private devotion. The most important component parts of the *Khuṭba* are as follows: 'the praise of God' (*ḥamd allāh*) and 'the prayer for the Prophet' (*aṣ-ṣalāt alā'n-nabī*), the Koran recitation (*Kirā'a*), the 'recommendation of the fear of God' (*al-waṣiyya bi't-taḳwā*), and the 'supplication for the Faithful' (*ad-du'ā li'l-mu'minin*). The Koran recitation corresponds, according to Professor Mittwoch, to the reading of the Law, the 'recommendation of the fear of God' to the Haftārāh, 'the praise of God' and 'the prayer for the Prophet' to the benedictions accompanying these recitations, 'the supplication for the Faithful' to יְקוֹם פְּרִקָן, and the sitting down of the preacher to the sitting down during *Gelilah*. Yet on close examination we find that none of these points of contact is such as to carry full conviction. First of all, there is a radical and, on the assumption of historic connexion, scarcely explicable divergence in that in Judaism these various parts of the service are distributed over a number of persons, while in Islam they are limited to one. Then the Koran recitation consists only of a few Koran verses. The 'recommendation of the fear of God' is entirely different from the Haftārāh,—one only need compare the specimen of a *Khuṭba* reproduced by Lane (*Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, Ch. III). The sitting down during *Gelilah* is in setting and purpose fundamentally different from the sitting down of the preacher, and even the 'supplication for the Faithful' which offers the most convincing point of contact may be a natural coincidence.

How slippery such wholesale comparisons may be, can be
VOL. IV. Y y

seen from the fact that Professor Becker in the article quoted above marshals a whole array of facts to show the complete dependence of the Mohammedan Friday ritual on the Christian Sunday service. Whether Becker's theory is true or nearer to truth can only be determined by one who is intimately acquainted with the form of Christian prayer such as prevailed in the period under consideration. The adaptation will scarcely have been as extensive and, above all, as systematic as Professor Becker is inclined to assume. But, if one may rely on what is rather a subjective impression in this domain of hypothesis, his derivation of the double *Khutba* from the corresponding scheme of the Christian service seems more natural than Professor Mittwoch's fascinating comparison. As in so many other cases, the truth will be found to lie midway. Islam did not consciously or systematically imitate Judaism or Christianity. It borrowed unconsciously, one might say, with childlike inconsistency, the elements it needed for its growth, often guided by externalities which catch the eye,—hence the imitation of minutiae which seems so surprising. Further investigation may show that the Mohammedan ritual is indebted alike to Jewish and Christian models and may also lay bare the transformation which these models have undergone in their adaptation to a new and in many respects radically different environment.

In the delicate and difficult domain of interreligious relationship agreement is often impossible, and subjective hypothesis is frequently called upon to supply the lack of objective facts. But whether we agree with all of Professor Mittwoch's theories, there is no doubt that he has greatly advanced the subject of his inquiry. Even where not tenable, his ideas suggest possibilities which will have to be borne in mind in all future investigations, and will ultimately bear rich fruit. The author is right in emphasizing, against recent denials, the fact that the influence of Judaism upon Islam was by no means limited to the time of the Prophet, but was of great importance—I would say, of much greater importance,—during the subsequent period of the development and consolidation of Mohammedan law (p. 42). 'To illustrate this,

as if by a paradigm, by the theory of the Mohammedan prayer and cult,' was, as the author tells us (*ibid.*), the purpose of his book. This purpose Professor Mittwoch has fully achieved. His treatise has whetted our appetite for the larger project which is to embrace the whole province of Mohammedan law, and every one who is interested in the important and attractive borderland in which Judaism and Islam meet or a mutual exchange of goods will look forward with keen anticipation to the promised publication.

ISRAEL FRIEDLAENDER.

Jewish Theological Seminary
of America.